

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS/INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. Claim 1 was cancelled in an earlier amendment. Claim 7 is currently amended. In view of the following amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

I. Interview Summary

Justin Rand, attorney for Applicant, conferred via telephone with Examiner Jorgenson on July 22, 2004. During the interview, Examiner Jorgenson agreed that Chang does not show or suggest a moveable frame that is pivotable relative to a pivotable console lid, as the console lid and the movable frame described in Chang are one and the same. This arrangement is best illustrated in Figure 2 of Chang, at reference numerals 22, 24, and 50. They cannot pivot relative to each other. For this reason, Examiner Jorgenson agreed to withdraw the § 102 rejection of claims 2-5 over Chang.

Mr. Rand and Examiner Jorgenson also discussed a proposed amendment to Claim 7, detailed below. No agreement was reached regarding this amendment.

II. Rejection of Claims 2-5 Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 2-5 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,409,242 to Chang ("Chang"). As detailed above, Examiner Jorgenson has agreed that this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Claim 6

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,494,447 to Zaidan ("Zaidan"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Examiner states that Chang teaches self-tensioning hinges, but not pinions, and that Zaidan teaches the use of a pinion to help a display part to remain stationary at any angle relative to a base part. The combination of Chang and Zaidan does not disclose each and every feature of claim 2, and claim 6 is dependent on claim 2. As Examiner Jorgenson agrees, Chang does not teach, nor would it obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Chang to construct an apparatus having a pivotable screen mounted in a pivotable lid. Therefore, claim 6 is allowable, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

B. Claims 7-12

Claims 7-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,276,589 to Bartlett et al. ("Bartlett") in view of Zaidan. The Examiner states that Bartlett teaches a frame pivotally attached to a console lid, a display screen defined within the frame, and the console lid having a compartment defined therein to receive the frame. The Examiner also states that Bartlett shows the bottom horizontal portion of the frame member as being

substantially rigid and that the hinge extending from the frame of Bartlett allows the frame to be rotated around a single axis, but does not teach a friction pinion. The Examiner states that Zaidan teaches the use of a pinion to help a display part remain stationary at any angle relative to a base part. The Examiner claims that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the pinion as taught by Zaidan with the console lid mounted screen as taught by Bartlett. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 7 has been further amended to better define the present invention by adding the phrases "to at least an open position and a closed position" and "wherein said display screen is inaccessible when said frame is in said closed position". This amendment is supported at least by Figures 3 and 4 of the specification, which clearly show the open and closed positions and the inaccessibility of the display screen in the closed position. The screen of Bartlett is specifically designed to be accessible in any of its pivotable positions. When the frame is closed, as shown in Figure 4 of Bartlett, the screen can be pivoted so that it is still accessible. When the movable frame of the present invention is in its closed position, the screen is inaccessible and protected from damage. There would be no reason to modify Bartlett so that one of the positions of the screen was inaccessible, since the purpose of the pivoting screen is to allow accessibility from multiple angles.


Appl. No. 09/823,587
Amdt. dated August 11, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 12, 2004

As the combination of Bartlett and Zaidan do not disclose or suggest each and every element claimed in claim 7 as amended, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn. As claims 8-12 depend from claim 7 and include each and every limitation of claim 7, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8-12 are allowable as well.

IV. Conclusion

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome each of the rejections. The application is therefore in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, the Examiner believes that the amendments and remarks do not put the claims in condition for allowance, the undersigned attorney can be reached at (312) 245-5394 to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Justin B. Rand
Registration No. 48,552

Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200